DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 757 CG 017 885

AUTHOR Holloway, Elizabeth L.; Wampold, Bruce E.
TITLE Dimensions of Satisfaction in the Supervision Interview.
PUB DATE Aug 84
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (92nd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, August 24-28, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Counselors; Counselor Training; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Interviews; Participant Satisfaction; *Supervision; Test Construction; Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS *Supervisor Personal Reaction Scale; *Trainee Personal Reaction Scale

ABSTRACT

While supervisory research focuses on trainee performance in counseling situations as the primary outcome criterion, few instruments have been developed for evaluating behavior in the supervision interview. To develop a scale that reflects critical factors in the supervisory relationship, the Supervisor Personal Reaction Scale (SPRS) and the Trainee Personal Reaction Scale (TPRS) were factor analyzed using 140 and 141 questionnaires, respectively. The results indicated that for both the SPRS and TPRS, 12 items of the original 32-item questionnaires defined three relatively independent factors. Since the items within each factor for both the SPRS and TPRS were conceptually parallel, the three subscales were labelled in the same way for each scale. The subscales, each with four items apiece, were labelled Evaluation of Other, Evaluation of Self, and Level of Comfort. The new 12-item questionnaires were named the SPRS-Revised (SPRS-R) and the TPRS-Revised (TPRS-R). The new scales provide useful measures for research and for the training of supervisors. (Author/JAC)

Dimensions of Satisfaction in the Supervision Interview

Elizabeth L. Holloway and Bruce E. Wampold

University of Utah

Running Head: Supervision Satisfaction

Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Convention, Toronto, Canada, August, 1984.

Abstract

The Supervisor Personal Reaction Scale (SPRS) and the Trainee Personal Reaction Scale (TPRS) were factor analyzed using 140 and 141 questionnaires, respectively. The results indicated that for both the SPRS and TPRS, 12 items of the original 32-item questionnaires defined three relatively independent factors. Since the items within each factor for both the SPRS and TPRS were conceptually parallel, the three subscales were labelled in the same way for each scale. The subscales, each with 4 items apiece, were labelled as follows: (a) Evaluation of Other, (b) Evaluation of Self and (c) Level of Comfort. The new 12 item questionnaires were named the SPRS - revised (SPRS-R) and the TPRS - revised (TPRS-R). The application of the subscales to previous research is presented and implications for the SPRS-R and the TPRS-R in research and training in supervision are discussed.

With few exceptions, researchers of supervision have depended primarily on counselor rating scales to evaluate supervision outcomes. Two circumstances support this situation. First, most supervisory research focuses on trainee performance in a counseling situation as the primary outcome criterion (Hansen, Robins and Grimes, 1982; Lambert, 1980). Therefore, counselor rating scales such as the counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS; Myrick & Kelly, 1971), the Counselor Rating Form (CRF; Barack & LaCrosse, 1975) and the Barrett-Leonard Relationship Inventory (Barrett-Leonard, 1962) are useful and relevant to these types of experimental questions.

Second, there are few psychometrically validated instruments that have been developed exclusively for evaluating supervisor and trainee behavior in the supervision interview. Because of the paucity of supervision instruments, researchers, with a few notable exceptions (Doehrmann 1976; Heppner and Handley, 1982; Holloway, 1979; Holloway & Wampold, 1983; Worthington & Roehlke 1979), have used instruments to assess the supervision relationship that have actually been developed for and validated on the counseling relationship. For instance, Carkhuff's Scales (Carkhuff, 1969) are very frequently used to indicate the supervisor's delivery of facilitative conditions in supervision (e.g. Dalton & Sundblad, 1976; Lambert & Beier, 1974; Pierce, Carkhufff & Berenson, 1967; Pierce & Schauble, 1970, 1971). Scales such as the CERS and the CRF are aplied to determine supervisors' attractiveness to trainees (e.g., Dodenhoff, 1981; Hester, Weitz, Anchor & Roback, 1976). "Satisfaction" ratings such as the Interview Rating Scale (Anderson & Anderson, 1962) and the Barrett-Leonard Relationship Inventory (1962) are employed to indicate

trainees' and supervisors' satisfaction with the supervision interview (e.g., Lennons & Lanning, 1979). Although supervisor's delivery of facilitative conditions, attractiveness to trainee, and trainee's performance might be relevant to evaluation in supervision, other evaluation measures, designed specifically for the supervisory context, warrant consideration.

Doehrman (1976), in a phenomenological study of parallel processes in supervision, developed a paper-and-pencil Likert-type questionnaire to rate both trainee's and supervisors' perceptions of the supervisory relationship. Her scales, although sensitive and revealing in her own study (when used in connection with clinical interview data) have not been further developed psychometrically. Another instrument developed for the supervisory context is the Supervisor Questionnaire (SQ; Worthington and Roehlke, 1979) which measures trainees' judgement of supervisors' performance in supervision. The questionnaire includes 42 supervisor behaviors rated on 5-point Likert-type rating scales. Factor analysis of the SQ revealed two primary factors that were labelled Evaluation and Support. Heppner and Handley (1982) used the SQ to measure supervisors' judgment of their own supervisory behaviors.

We were interested in developing a scale that reflects critical factors in the supervisory relationship. However, in addition to evaluating the supervisors' behaviors from both participants point of view, as was the case in Doehrman (1976) and Worthington and Roehlke (1979), we included evaluative dimensions that reflect the trainees' behavior as a trainee. By including both supervisors' and trainees' judgments of trainees behaviors <u>in the supervision interview</u> we have deviated from two traditional assumptions: (a) that the supervisor is solely responsible for directing the supervisory

interview and is the focus of evaluation within the supervision interview, and (b) that the trainee is primarily responsible for his/her behavior as a counselor and therefore is evaluated in the counseling interview. Our instrument also differs from the SQ in that it measures reactions to a particular interview rather than reactions at the termination of the supervisory relationship. We felt that focusing on the supervision interaction itself would be helpful in understanding effective supervisor and trainee communication strategies within the context of supervision.

Our development and use of two scales - the Supervisor Personal Reaction Scale (SPRS) and the Trainee Personal Reaction Scale (TPRS) emerged from our empirical study of supervisory behavior. We wanted an instrument that: (a) was a self-report, paper and pencil instrument; (b) had a completion time of 10 minutes or less; (c) described dimensions of the supervisory interview and supervisory relationship; (d) could be administered repeatedly to the same participants after different supervision interviews; (e) could measure dimensions of satisfaction of supervision from the supervisor's and trainee's points of view; and (f) could be applied for both research and training purposes. The present paper reports the development, psychometric structure and application of SPRS and TPRS.

METHOD

Development of SPRS and TPRS

The SPRS and TPRS resulted from an adaptation of the Therapist Personal Reaction Scale (ThPRS) and Client Personal Reaction Scale (CPRS) reported by Ashby, Ford, Guerney and Guerney (1957). The original ThPRS and CPRS were constructed in an identical fashion each with two subscales, named Negative or

Defensive and Positive. All 35 items of the ThPRS and 40 items of the CPRS were measured on a Likert-type scale of 1 to 5. Total scores of each subscale are computed. The "Negative" subscale of ThPRS was intended to reflect the therapist's negative reactions to the therapy interview and the client. The "Positive" subscale reflects the therapist's feelings of progress, achievement and accomplishment with the client in therapy. The CPRS "Defensive" subscale indicates the client's negative reaction to the therapist and therapy. The "Positive" subscale indicates client feelings of progress, achievement and accomplishment. The SPRS and TPRS adapted the items of the ThPRS and CPRS, respectively and omitted those items that intuitively appeared irrelevant to the supervisory context. The first form of the scale included 32 items, with both negative and positive valence, measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale. The instructions for completing the questionnaire were as follows:

> During supervision, trainees (supervisors) have many different feelings and reactions. These reactions are sometimes negative, sometimes positive, and sometimes mixed. Having varied feelings and reactions toward your supervisor (trainee) is not undesirable as long as you recognize and understand them. I am interested in learning what feelings trainees (supervisors) have toward supervision sessions. There are five possible answers to each item in the questionnaire. They are: 1. Not characteristic of my present feelings. 2. Slightly characteristic of my present feelings. 3. Moderately characteristic of my present feelings. 4. Quite characteristic of my present feelings. 5. Highly characteristic of my present feelings. Put a circle around the

answer most representative of your PRESENT feelings about the supervision session you just participated in. Thank you for your cooperation.

Because it was not obvious that the same defensive, negative and positive dimensions might be present in the scales when used in a supervisory context and because a factor analysis had not been performed on the original ThPRS and CPRS, it appeared that such an analysis would be an important and necessary aspect of understanding the usefulness of the scales.

Validation Samples and Procedures

The SPRS and TPRS were used in two different studies during a period of three years (Holloway, 1979; Holloway & Wampold, 1983). The first study (Holloway, 1979) was an analogue design with beginning level supervisors and traineees. The second study was carried out in a naturalistic setting over a period of two quarters in different academic years. Experienced doctoral level supervisors and beginning masters level trainees participated in the later study. All supervisors had a minimum of a didactic course and supervised practicum in supervision. All trainees had at least a prepracticum interviewing course. The participants for each study were from different counseling programs. Data was collected from a total of 22 supervisors (14 women, 8 men) and 66 trainees (42 women, 24 men). The total number of interview was 150. There were 140 SPRS and 141 TPRS questionnaires used in the data analysis. The remaining questionnaires were incompletely filled out and eliminated from the data set.

The Analogue Study. Doctoral and masters students in counseling and guidance were assigned supervisor and trainee roles, respectively, for a

simulated supervision session. All participants viewed a 10.5 minute videotape consisting of five segements of an actual client-counselor interaction. The counseling videotape provided an appropriate common topic of discussion for the subsequent supervision interviews. Each supervisor was randomly assigned two trainees for 45 minute individual supervision sessions. Participants were instructed to (a) focus their supervision disccussion on the client in the videotape; (b) act as if the client in the videotape had been referred to the trainee and would see the trainee the next week for counseling; and (c) behave as if both supervisor and trainee would have the opportunity to meet again the following week. All interviews were audio-taped. At the completion of the interview, supervisors and trainees independently completed the SPRS and TPRS, respectively,

The Naturalistic Study. Supervisors were asked to audiotape sessions 3, 6 and 9 of their regular weekly one-hour supervision sessions with each of their counselor trainees. The distribution of recorded interviews across the 12-week quarter helped to produce a final sample that would be representative of different stages of the supervisory relationship as it progressed during the quarter. At the conslusion of each interview the supervisor and trainee independently completed the SPRS and TPRS, respectively, and deposited them in a return box. The supervisors and trainees were asked not to discuss their responses with each other at any time during the quarter and were assured that their ratings would in no way influence their evaluation in the practicum course.

Analyses and Results

Selection of Items

A preliminary factor analyses with orthogonal rotation on the 32 items of

the SPRS and TPRS was conducted to investigate the factorial structure of the SPRS and the TPRS. As reported elsewhere (Holloway and Wampold, 1983), this analysis revealed three primary factors for each scale: Factor 1, Evaluation of Other; Factor 2, Evaluation of Self; and Factor 3, Level of Comfort.

The objective of this analysis was to select items from the SPRS and the TPRS to form revised scales (SPRS-R and TPRS-R) that would have reliable and relatively independent subscales. As with any factor analysis with orthogonal rotations the three factors from the preliminary factor analysis yielded factors that were uncorrelated. The usual practice is then to select those items that load highest on the first factor to comprise the first subscore, those items that load highest on the second factor to form the second subscale, and so forth. Unfortunately, because items load on more than one factor, the subscales can easily be highly correlated even though factors are independent (Gorsuch, 1974). We chose a strategy to select items for the scales that would attenuate the inter-subscale correlations.[1] As suggested by Gorsuch (1974), those items that loaded most heavily on more than one factor were eliminated, leaving items that loaded primarly on one factor. The items selected for each subscale are shown in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 About Here

To determine whether the subscales had desirable properties, a number of analyses were conducted. First, Cronbach's alpha was calculated for each subscale to establish internal consistency (Nunnally, 1967). These values are found in the diagonals of Table 2. The average alpha for the six subscales was .78.

Insert Table 2 about Here

Second, the inter-subscale correlations were calculated and appear in Table 2. The average inter-subscale correlation was .45. Although this value is not negligible, it is substantially lower than the average inter-subscale correlations for factor analystic studies that do not select items based on their relative contributions to factor. Finally, a principle component factor analysis with varimax rotation (Morrison, 1976) was conducted on the items comprising the SPRS-R and the TPRS-R. As can be seen in Table 3, the items in each scale loaded most heavily on the corresponding factor, as would be expected by using the strategy described above.

Insert Table 3 About Here

Discussion

The Validation Studies

In the analogue study (Holloway, 1979), the SPRS and TPRS were used as global scales resulting in one total score. There were no significant differences between the participants' ratings of the interviews, although supervisors informally reported to the experimenter that they experienced different levels of frustration and adequacy with different trainees. It seemed that the overall score was not able to reflect these different reactions. Recognition that a supervisor or trainee could feel very positive about their own performance even though there were uncomfortable issues to

deal with and/or they judged their counterpart negatively in the interview, led to our interest in identifying relevant dimensions within the overall scale. In the naturalistic study (Holloway & Wampold, 1983), the factor scores of the scales were used as criterion variables in a multiple regression with patterns of supervisor and trainee interchange as the predictor variables. The use of separate factors within the scale proved valuable in identifying specific supervisory exchanges that corresponded to positive and negative reactions by the participants. For instance, the Level of Comfort subscale score for both participants increased when defensiveness or criticism on either the part of the supervisor or trainee was present in the interview. The Evaluation of Self subscale for both participants increased when the supervisor encouraged the trainee to expand on their ideas. The supervisor's Evaluation of Other subscale score decreased when trainees were defensive or used excessive positive social emotional behavior.[2]

The Subscales

The SPRS-R and TPRS-R have a number of advantages over the SPRS and TPRS. Reliable and relatively independent subscales have been developed that have conceptually clear meanings. The subscales can be completed easily and score on the subscales can be calculated simply by the supervisor and trainee, by the researcher or the supervisor educator. It should be mentioned that validation studies of the SPRS-R and the TPRS-R were conducted using total scores or factor scores. Therefore, it remains to be shown conclusively that the subscales of the SPRS and TPRS will have equally useful application.

The items of each factor in the SPRS-R and TPRS-R appear to group together in a meaningful and consistent way. Items that reflect self

evaluation, other evaluation, and level of comfort emerged as factors in each scale. The items themselves appear to tap interpersonal attributes, social interaction and performance judgments rather than specific techniques or strategies. Unlike the revised Worthington and Roehlke (1979; Heppner & Handley, 1982) questionnaire, the scales do not deal with the incidence of particular supervisory strategies for evaluation. The SPRS-R and TPRS-R factors provide a gauge for the climate of a particular interview as seen from the different perspectives of the supervisor and the trainee.

Each of the subscales, Evaluation of Other, Evaluation of Self and Level of Comfort can be explained within the context of the supervisory relationship. The subscale, Evaluation of Other, appears salient not only because of one's natural reaction to judge one's counterpart in any social interaction, but also because of the component of evaluation in supervision. Both participants are aware that their skills are being judged; the trainee to demonstrate competency as a counselor, the supervisor to be a skillful teacher. The Evaluation of Self subscale of the SPRS-R may reflect the supervisors' implicit responsibility to guide the interview (i.e., to instruct and to consult) and thus the need for self examination of their own supervisory behaviors that will facilitate the trainee's learning. The supervisors' Level of Comfort Subscale on the other hand, may be tapping the supervisors on-going judgment of their performance in the interview. The TPRS-R sbuscale, Level of Comfort most likely reflects the trainees awareness of the supervisors explicit obligation to evaluate the trainees' performance and the supervisors' superordinate position in the relationship. The TPRS-R subscale, Evaluation of Self, reflects the trainees' judgments of their own

responses to the supervisors. The characteristics of this subscale raise an interesting issue. As mentioned earlier, trainee instruction and evaluation has focused on the trainees' performance in the counseling relationship. There are very few empirical studies that examine trainee behavior in the supervisory interview as a relevant outcome event. Not surprisingly, then, there are no explicit guidelines for appropriate or effective trainee behavior in this context. Clearly, however, supervisors make judgments about trainees based on the trainees' supervisory responses; behavior that is distinct from that directly representative of their counseling performance. For instance, the psychodynamic model of supervision emphasizes the importance of trainee behavior in supervision as a reflection of their countertransference in the counseling relationship (Ekstein & Wallerstein, 1974). It would seem that the TPRS-R subscale Evaluation of Self offers a new dimension to supervision evaluation.

Application to Research and Training

The factor analysis of the SPRS-R and TPRS-R has resulted in a questionnaire that is brief, reliable, and measures three dimensions of satisfaction that appear conceptually relevant to the supervision process. In research and in the training of supervisors, the scales might be used (a) to identify supervisory behaviors that promote or detract from the relationship; (b) to examine the trainee's supervisory behavior as an outcome measure; (c) to compare supervisor's and trainee's perceptions of the supervisory interview; (d) to compare supervisor's ratings of self and trainee's rating of other and vice versa; and (e) to track the change in satisfaction with the supervisory relationship across time from supervisor's and trainee's

perspectives.

As evidenced by two recent volumes of The Counseling Psychologist (Supervision I, Vol. 1982; Supervision II, in press) supervision is currently attracting considerable attention. Evaluation instruments that measure supervisory behaviors, attitudes, and perceptions will be a necessary component of the research and practice of supervision. Hopefully, the SPRS-R and TPRS-R will contribute to these endeavors.

References

Anderson, R.P. & Anderson, G.V. Development of an instrument for measuring support. Personal and Guidance Journal, 1962, 41, 18-24.

Ashby, J.D., Ford, D.H., Guerney, G.B. & Guerney, L.F. (1957). Effects on clients of a reflective and leading type of psychotherapy. Psychological Monographs, 71, 1-32.

Barak, A., & LaCrosse, M.B. (1975). Multidimensional perception of counselor behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22, 471-476.

Barrett-Leonard, G.T. (1962). Dimensions of perceived therapist response as causal factors in therapeutic change. Psychological Monographs, 76 (43, Whole No. 453).

Carkhuff, R.R. (1969). Helping and human relations (Vol. 2). New York: Holt Rinehart, and Winston.

Carkhuff, R.R., & Berenson, B.G. (1967). Beyond counseling and therapy. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Dalton, R.F., Jr., & Sundblad, L.M. (1976). Using principals of social learning in training for communication of empathy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 454-457.

Dodenhoff, J.T. (1981). Interpersonal attraction and direct-indirect supervisor influence as predictors of counselor trainee effectiveness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28, 47-52.

Doehrman, J.T. (1976). Parallel processes in supervision and psychotherapy. Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, 40, 249-307.

Ekstein, R., & Wallerstein, R.S. (1974). The teaching and learning of psychotherapy. New York: Basic Books.

Gorsuch, R.L. (1974). Factor analysis. Philadelphia, W.B. Saunders.

Hansen, J.C., Robins, T.H., Grimes, J. (1982). Review of research on practicum supervision. Counselor Education Supervision, 22, 15-24.

Heppner, P.P., & Handley, P. (1982). The relationship between supervisory behaviors and perceived expertness, attractiveness, or trustworthiness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 22, 37-46.

Hester, L.R., Wertz, L.J., Anchor, K.N., & Roback, H.B. (1976). Supervisor attraction as a function of level of supervision skillfulness and supervisee's perceived similarity. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 254-258.

Holloway E.L. (1979). The effects of conceptual level on clinical hypothesis formation and the supervision interview (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin). Dissertation Abstracts International, 3121 (University Microfilms No. 313130).

Holloway, E.L., & Wampold, B.E. (1983). Patterns of verbal behavior and judgments of satisfaction in the supervision interview. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30, 227-234.

Lambert, M.J. (1980). Research and the supervisory process. In A.K. Hess (ed.) Psychotherapy Supervision: Theory, Research and Practice. New York: Wiley, 423-450.

Lambert, M.J. & Beier, E.G. (1974). Supervisory and counseling process: A comparative study. Counselor Education and Supervision, 14, 54-60.

Lennons, S. & Lanning, W.E. (1979). Value system similarity and the supervisory relationship. Counselor Education and Supervision, 19, 13-19.

Morrison, D.F. (1976). Multivariate statistical methods. New York: McGraw

Hill.

Myrick, R.D., & Kelly, F.D. (1971). A scale for evaluating practicum students in counseling and supervision. Counselor Education Supervision, 10, 330-336.

Nunnally, J.C. (1967). Psychometric Theory. New York: McGraw Hill.

Pierce, R.M., Carkhuff, R.R., & Berensen, B.G. (1967). The effects of high and low functioning counselors on counselors in training. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 212-215.

Pierce, R.M. & Schauble, P.G. (1970). Graduate training of facilitative counselors: The effects of individual supervision. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 17, 210-215.

Pierce, R.M. & Schauble, P.G. (1971). Study of the effects of individual supervision in graduate school training. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18, 186-187.

The Counseling Psychologist. (1982). Supervision in Counseling I, 10.

The Counseling Psychologist. Supervision in Counseling II, in press.

Worthington, E.L., & Roehlke, H.J. (1979). Effective supervision of beginning counselors in training. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 26, 64-73.

Footnotes

[1]An alternate strategy and one which yields independent subscales is to calculate factor scores (Gorsuch, 1974; Morrison, 1976). Factor scores take into account items' relative loadings on each factor. Although factor scores are useful (e.g., Holloway, & Wampold, 1983), they are difficult to calculate, particularly when applied to data other than that used in the factor analysis. Furthermore, the adequacy of factor scores shows degradation upon cross-validation whereas, the method we used is quite robust (Gorsuch, 1974). Our objective was to generate subscales that could be used easily in research and practice.

[2]The subscales of the SPRS and TPRS were predicted by several other supervisor and trainee verbal behaviors as reported in Holloway and Wampold (1983).

Table 1

Listing of Subscale Items for the SPRS-R and the TPRS-R

SPRS-R

Subscale 1: Evaluation of Trainee

1. I have a warm, friendly reaction to this trainee.
2. I disagree with this trainee about some basic matters.
3. I was very absorved in what this trainee was saying.
4. I'm glad this particular trainee was assigned to me.

Subscale 2: Evaluation of Self as Supervisor

5. It was hard to know how to respond to this trainee in a helpful way.
6. I usually found significant things to respond to in what the trainee said.
7. I think I did a pretty competent job with this trainee.
8. I felt pretty ineffective with this trainee.

Subscale 3: Level of Comfort in the Interview

9. I was seldom in doubt about what the trainee was trying to say.
10. Sometimes I felt pretty frustrated during the interview.
11. Sometimes I got pretty tense during the interview.
12. I think we had a pretty relaxed, understanding kind of relationship during the interview.

TPRS-R

Subscale 1: Evaluation of Supervisor

1. I was eager to hear what my supervisor had to say.
2. My supervisor's attitude gave me hope that I can really get something out of supervision.
3. Many of the things my supervisor said really hit the nail-on-the-head.
4. I gained more respect for supervision as a result of my experience with this supervisor.

Subscale 2: Evaluation of Self as Trainee

5. Sometimes the supervisor seemed to twist around the things I said to mean something different than what I intended.
6. Sometimes after the supervisor said something I just couldn't think of any response.
7. I felt my supervisor wanted me to come to some conclusions about the client, but I didn't know exactly what.
8. I sometimes felt like I was being put-on-the spot.

table 1 cont'd

Subscale 3: Level of Comfort in the Interview

9. At times, I hesitated to tell my supervisor what I was really thinking.
10. I got irritated at some of my supervisor's remarks.
11. I don't know exactly why, but I felt nervous during the interview.
12. I sometimes resented my supervisor's attitude toward me.

Note. The SPRS-R and TPRS-R should present the subscale items in random order and not as numbered in this table.

Table 2

Correlations among Subscales and Internal Consistencies for the SPRS-R and TPRS-R

	SPRS-R		
	Subscale 1	Subscale 2	Subscale 3
Subscale 1	(.83)	.50	.54
Subscale 2		(.72)	.49
Subscale 3			(.78)

	TPRS-R		
	Subscale 1	Subscale 2	Subscale 3
Subscale 1:	(.89)	.31	.42
Subscale 2:		(.71)	.42
Subscale 3:			(.76)

Note. Measures of internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) are found in parentheses.

Table 3

Orthogonal Rotated Factor Analyses for the SPRS-R and TPRS-R

SPRS-R

Items	Factor Loadings: Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Subscale 1			
1	.79		
2	.43		
3	.61		
4	.89		
Subscale 2			
5		.61	
6		.44	
7		.60	
8		.67	
Subscale 3			
9			.59
10		.39	.48
11			.71
12			.71

TPRS-R

Items[b]	Factor Loadings[a]: Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Subscale 1			
1	.65		
2	.80		
3	.81		
4	.92		
Subscale 2			
1		.51	
2		.44	
3		.57	
4		.78	
Subscale 3			
1			.71
2			.69
3			.64
4			.47

Note[a]. Factor Loadings less than .35 were omitted
Note[b]. Items are listed in Table 1.